

Date: Mon, 4 Jan 93 12:06:05 PST
From: Info-Hams Mailing List and Newsgroup <info-hams@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Info-Hams-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Info-Hams Digest V93 #14
To: Info-Hams

Info-Hams Digest Mon, 4 Jan 93 Volume 93 : Issue 14

Today's Topics:

100 Mile Endurance Run Software
 ATTN: Jeff Jones
 del
 DJ-580 soft case
NASA Project Dante & Compressed Video?
 QRP Transceiver For Sale
QSL Route info for: T28IO and FM/FE1L BG
 RFI susceptibility of new cars?
Who do repeater coordinators represent?
 Yeasu FT-470 mods?

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Info-Hams-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Info-Hams Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/info-hams".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 4 Jan 93 18:13:03 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: 100 Mile Endurance Run Software
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Greetings,
Before the holiday someone posted with a need for the software used by
amateur radio operators in support of a 100 mile endurance run. We played
phone tag, and I've mislaid the message. Would that person please get in
touch again?

been able to find one thru the dealers I usually purchase from. Anyone know of a store that has any or dealers that stock alot of the Alinco accessories?

Thanks,

Jeff Hite KF7SZ

jeffh@ludwig.cc.uoregon.edu

Date: Mon, 4 Jan 1993 19:18:14 GMT

From: sdd.hp.com!caen!uwm.edu!linac!att!cbnewsm!jeffj@network.UCSD.EDU

Subject: NASA Project Dante & Compressed Video?

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <01GT47Y1CA0G8WVYPA@TSU.BITNET> PORTER04%TSU.BITNET@cunyvm.cuny.edu writes:

>Fellow Netters,

> I was watching the news around New Year and saw the reports
>from MT. Erebus, Antartica. The video from there was rather strange
>looking, as though it was being compressed in the extreme(looked
>like only movement was being updated per frame). What I'm wondering
>is, what method of compression was being used. Also what comm system
>was used to get the video back so quickly. I am told that use of
>DOMSATS in equatorial orbit is not possible, maybe INMARSAT? It all
>looked very interesting>

Along those same lines, I was floored to find out they were using a cable to transmit commands to Dante. Seems like it would have been a whole lot easier to have had repeaters on the edge of the volcano and ran high speed packet to control the robot. Maybe as a ham these things occur to me.

73!

Jeff

--

Jeff Jones AB6MB |
jeffj@seeker.mystic.com |
Infolinc BBS 415-778-5929 |

Date: 4 Jan 93 13:52:54 GMT

From: auratek!epacyna@uunet.uu.net

Subject: QRP Transceiver For Sale

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

FOR SALE FOR SALE FOR SALE FOR SALE FOR SALE FOR SALE FOR SALE

Atlas QRP! RX110 receiver & TX110L transmitter (they plug together to trans-
ceive). Five bands (80-10M), SSB and CW (semi- breakin), power supply built
in, or can run directly from 12VDC. Power out adjustable (front panel) to
10W PEP..... \$ 250

Ed Pacyna W1AAZ
(617) 290-4800 work
(617) 631-8383 home
email: ed@auratek.com

Date: 4 Jan 93 18:06:03 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: QSL Route info for: T28IO and FM/FE1LBG
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

I wonder if anyone has QSL routes for T28IO (Tuvulu) and FM/FE1LBG (Bernard,
St. Joseph, Martinique)??? FE1LBG is not in '93 Call Book. Please direct
replies to N7YQR@amsat.org.

Thanks and 73,
Ed

Date: Mon, 04 Jan 1993 18:59:17 GMT
From: newsgate.watson.ibm.com!yktnews!admin!aixproj!uri@uunet.uu.net
Subject: RFI susceptibility of new cars?
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Date: 4 Jan 1993 16:58:18 GMT
From: swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!bcm!lib!oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu!jmaynard@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Who do repeater coordinators represent?
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Jan2.184109.13079@mnemosyne.cs.du.edu> rcanders@nyx.cs.du.edu (Rod
Anderson) writes:

>How valid is the claim of repeater owners right to exclusive use their
>frequency. After all they claim that the repeater frequency
>coordinators assigned the frequency to them. But do the repeater
>frequency coordinators represent the interests of the entire ham radio
>community or just the interests of the repeater owners.

In Texas, at least, the coordinators are, in fact, ultimately responsible to the entire ham community. Texas is split up into six zones. (It's a big state. :-) Each zone has one or more frequency coordinators; together, they make up the Frequency Coordination Committee, which is appointed by the State Frequency Coordinator (that post is currently held by Merle Taylor, WB5EPI). The State Frequency Coordinator is appointed by the President of the Texas VHF-FM Society, and confirmed by the Board of Directors. These folks are elected by the membership at large, and membership in the Society is open to any licensed amateur.

>It is important to recall that in many areas the repeater frequency
>coordinators have been appointed by the REPEATER owners. And the
>represent the REPEATER owners views and interests not those of the
>average ham or repeater user. The important thing to recall about
>frequency coordinators is they are more interested in making the
>repeater owners happy than the welfare of ham radio in general. To
>this end they have assigned as many frequencies to repeaters as they
>had available. In some cases they even assigned what are by the
>national band plan simplex frequencies as repeater input frequencies.

This paragraph does not apply to Texas.

>The local repeater coordinators have failed to save any frequencies
>for future use. It is suggested that the most effective form of
>packet radio is to have packet repeater. However in most areas there
>are no 2 m. frequencies available limiting this option

Once upon a time, the 220 Spectrum Management Association, in southern California, attempted to reserve frequencies for future use. When the time came that all of the frequencies were allocated except for the reserved ones, some folks wanted to get pairs. The coordinator at the time, Karl Pagel, N6BVU, refused to release the reserved frequencies. The requestors got together, formed a rival frequency coordination body, and proceeded to coordinate themselves on those channels; they then sued 220SMA and Pagel. Pagel gave in rather than face financial and personal ruin.

No, reserving frequencies for future use isn't practical.

>If repeater coordinators were chosen from ham radio in general rather
>than being creatures of the repeater owners there would be no problem
>with closed repeaters, there would be no members only closed repeaters
>on 2 m. The only real reason for a closed repeaters is to keep the
>jerks who insists that they have the right to use improper language,
>or harass other hams off the repeater.

Right. There are closed repeaters on 2 in Texas. Coordinators are chosen by, and from, the ham population in general. Next?

...Jay Maynard, K5ZC, director and past president, Texas VHF-FM Society

--

Jay Maynard, EMT-P, K5ZC, PP-ASEL | Never ascribe to malice that which can
jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu | adequately be explained by stupidity.

"Science is all in the public domain, and allows few secrets."

-- Tom Clancy, _The Sum of all Fears_

Date: 4 Jan 93 19:23:13 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: Yeasu FT-470 mods?
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

A few weeks ago, I purchased an FT-470 2m/70cm HT. I've been monitoring this newsletter for about 2 months, but so far have found no references to any mods pertaining to this HT. I do not have access to ftp, but would welcome e-mail, or a posting here advising me of possible mods to increase receive bandwidth, etc. --- or any other information of interest about this model.

*

* Terry

Date: 4 Jan 1993 17:02:17 GMT
From: swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!bcm!lib!oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu!jmaynard@network.UCSD.EDU
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <8245@lib.tmc.edu>, <1992Dec31.123918.1@ttd.teradyne.com>,
<1993Jan2.185545.13374@mnemosyne.cs.du.edu>
Subject : Re: 430mhz band under th

>I don't know what gives a repeater frequency coordinator the right to
>disregard the accepted national band plan and assign repeaters to
>simplex frequencies.

There's a statement in the national band plan that says that the ARRL recognizes that it doesn't have all the answers, and that local coordinators, who know the requirements of a given area, may deviate from the national band plan if they deem it necessary.

>After all they only speak for the repeater
>owners not the average users.

Not in Texas.

>Just think of how few closed repeaters

>there would be if all hams chose the repeater coordinators.

You mean, like in Texas? (There are more than a few closed repeaters here.)
Once upon a time, someone proposed outlawing closed repeaters on 2 in a Texas
VHF-FM Society meeting. The proposal was voted down overwhelmingly.

--

Jay Maynard, EMT-P, K5ZC, PP-ASEL | Never ascribe to malice that which can
jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu | adequately be explained by stupidity.

"Science is all in the public domain, and allows few secrets."

-- Tom Clancy, _The Sum of all Fears_

Date: Mon, 4 Jan 1993 18:37:42 GMT
From: swrinde!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!oak!laborde@network.UCSD.EDU
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jan02.061145.6961@ssc.com>,
<1993Jan3.010814.7938@elroy.jpl.nasa.gov>, <1993Jan04.041155.17364@ssc.com>
Subject : Re: 430mhz band under th

In article <1993Jan04.041155.17364@ssc.com> tad@ssc.com (Tad Cook) writes:
>In article <1993Jan3.010814.7938@elroy.jpl.nasa.gov> laborde@oak.Jpl.Nasa.Gov
(Gregory R. LaBorde) writes:

>>

>>Are you reading the same posts I am?

>>

>

>Gosh, I *THINK* so.....but maybe not!

>

>Regarding simplex QSOs.....of course no one is going to get in big

>trouble by accidentally stumbling across the odd frequency or input.

>But I thought we were talking about a bunch of folks on this newsgroup

>who think they have found some loophole to harrass operators of

>links, closed repeaters, or any other spectrum usage that they don't

>like.

>

I think the second paragraph contradicts the first sentence you wrote. I haven't
read a single post about a "bunch of folks who think they have found a loophole
to harrass operators of links, closed repeaters, or any other spectrum that they
don't like." I have read posts about the morality and legality of closed
repeaters essentially taking over frequencies, and operators thereof feeling
like they have some "right" to regulate use of "their" frequencies, but as far
as I know no one has planned a harrassment campaign. I thought we were talking
"what ifs?"

Have a nice day!

-grl.

Date: Mon, 4 Jan 1993 18:43:14 GMT

From: swrinde!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!oak!laborde@network.UCSD.EDU

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jan02.061920.7115@ssc.com>,

<1993Jan3.011010.8108@elroy.jpl.nasa.gov>, <1993Jan04.041314.17458@ssc.com>

Subject : Re: 430mhz band under th

In article <1993Jan04.041314.17458@ssc.com> tad@ssc.com (Tad Cook) writes:

>In article <1993Jan3.011010.8108@elroy.jpl.nasa.gov> laborde@oak.Jpl.Nasa.Gov
(Gregory R. LaBorde) writes:

>>In article <1993Jan02.061920.7115@ssc.com> tad@ssc.com (Tad Cook) writes:

>>>

>>>Let me see if I have this straight (!)..... :)

>>>

>>>I get my 440 MHz link set up, and get a coordinated frequency from

>>>the local coordination council. Everything works fine, until one

>>>day YOU show up and start transmitting there.

>>>

>>>And *I* have to turn off my gear??

>>>

>>>I don't think so!

>>>

>>Of course you don't HAVE to turn your gear off. Just don't whine about him

>>using your repeater.

>>

>

>Why do you characterize jamming a link freq as "using your repeater"??

Sorry, my error. I caught that after I already posted it. If your LINK FREQUENCY is not in use, and assuming it is on an easily recognized frequency for that use, then I am being a rude anti-social SOB by LEGALLY transmitting on a frequency that I am licensed to do so on. Rude, but not breaking any laws. If your link comes up and interferes with my QSO, it is YOU who are breaking the law (even though I am still the rude SOB).

By the way, Tad, please recognize that I am NOT planning to come and transmit on your 440 link frequency just to "show you."

Still, have a nice day!

-grl.

Date: (null)

From: (null)

Basically, unless one becomes the Galactic Overlord of Amateur Radio, with Ghodlike powers to dictate what is "righteous", there won't EVER be a consensus of how spectrum will be used. Unfortunately, there are those who assume they have this power. And THAT is the basis of the problem.

Run, lemmings, run!

--

Kurt Freiburger, wb5bbw kurt@cs.tamu.edu 409/847-8607 fax:409/847-8578
Dept. of Computer Science, Texas A&M University DoD #264: BMW R80/7 pilot
"We preserve our freedom using three boxes: ballot, jury, and cartridge."
*** Not an official document of Texas A&M University ***

Date: 4 Jan 1993 17:06:24 GMT

From: usc!cs.utexas.edu!tamsun.tamu.edu!cs.tamu.edu!kurt@network.UCSD.EDU

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jan1.151157.23852@ke4zv.uucp>,
<1993Jan4.045245.1386@aio.jsc.nasa.gov>, <1993Jan4.142955.10052@ke4zv.uucp>
Subject : Re: 430 mhz band under th (now private/closed repeaters)

In article <1993Jan4.142955.10052@ke4zv.uucp>, gary@ke4zv.uucp (Gary Coffman) writes:

|> BZZZZZZT! Very wrong answer. The engineer is *completely* responsible
|> for the robustness and usability of the system. Designing a remote
|> control system so that any user command can cause equipment damage
|> is simply unacceptable engineering. That's why interlocks, limit switches,
|> and overload trips were invented.

And the reason why people circumvent them. AND the reason why products are so damned expensive!!!! I'm sure that Brian's folks are planning to get that problem taken care of. However, does this mean they should shut it down because it can't be used by the Masses? No, they limit access so that it CAN be used by the folks who are concerned. As a member of the Masses, I could see the toy, and I wanna play with it. But if they won't let me use it, I'll go my way. Of course, if I were a good Communist, I'd immediately try to have it taken away and "given to the People".

Hmmm, could 2 meters be considered the Amateur Radio gulag?

--

Kurt Freiburger, wb5bbw kurt@cs.tamu.edu 409/847-8607 fax:409/847-8578
Dept. of Computer Science, Texas A&M University DoD #264: BMW R80/7 pilot
"We preserve our freedom using three boxes: ballot, jury, and cartridge."
*** Not an official document of Texas A&M University ***

Date: (null)
From: (null)
Hey, that's called "free radar detector"! (-)
Any particular frequency, where this effect is
the most pronounced? (-) [I'd try it myself!]
--

Regards,
Uri. uri@watson.ibm.com

<Disclaimer>

Date: 4 Jan 1993 18:06:13 GMT
From: usc!cs.utexas.edu!bcm!lib!oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu!jmaynard@network.UCSD.EDU
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <1992Dec28.235602.1@ttd.teradyne.com>, <8228@lib.tmc.edu>,
<1993Jan02.200308.16355@eng.umd.edu>
Subject : Re: 430mhz band under th

In article <1993Jan02.200308.16355@eng.umd.edu> chuck@eng.umd.edu (Chuck Harris - WA3UQV) writes:

>In article <8228@lib.tmc.edu> jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu (Jay Maynard) writes:
>>Your argument boils down to "If they want to spend \$10K on a sophisticated
>>repeater system, they have to make it a public utility". There are two
>If you want to park your \$10K machine on a public frequency, then you should
>expect it to be used as a public utility. If you are not expecting that,
>then you should move out of the way so that others can use the frequency.

You're forgetting those folks who, 10 to 15 years ago, were told that they
were not welcome on 2 meters, but that 440 was fine for their closed box. They
spent lots of bucks to get that box going. Now you're going to change the
rules on them in midstream and say, "Now, your repeater is a public utility;
never mind what we told you all those years ago."

Fairness in action.

>This "I own the frequency" crap IS the largest problem with Ham radio today.
>Nothing compels you to put up a repeater. You do so, in part out of public
>service, in part out technical interest, and in part out of stroking your own

>ego. Nothing wrong with that. The rest of the Ham community puts up with your
>hogging of the frequency with your repeater because it expects to be able to
>use it from time to time when it wishes to, or needs to.

"Needs to"? How do you define that? If you mean an emergency (and I use a broad definition of the term), then I agree - and I don't believe that the trustee of a closed repeater would bring it down, or run off, someone with an emergency. The owners of the closed repeaters I use certainly wouldn't. (Right, Jim?) "Wishes to"? Their wishes hold no more water than mine to operate my equipment to the benefit of those people I wish; since it's my radio, I get to control how it's used.

>If you still can't deal with your
>"great act of charity", then take your repeater down, and let someone else use
>the allocation. There are plenty of hams out there who would love to put up an
>open repeater on your pair!

Fortunately for reason, the FCC disagrees. I suggest you reread 97.205(e).

--

Jay Maynard, EMT-P, K5ZC, PP-ASEL | Never ascribe to malice that which can
jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu | adequately be explained by stupidity.

"Science is all in the public domain, and allows few secrets."

-- Tom Clancy, _The Sum of all Fears_

Date: 4 Jan 1993 16:33:39 GMT

From: usc!cs.utexas.edu!tamsun.tamu.edu!cs.tamu.edu!kurt@network.UCSD.EDU

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <1992Dec31.150918.17046@ke4zv.uucp>, <C053IC.6H4@NeoSoft.com>,
<1993Jan1.150034.23723@ke4zv.uucp>

Subject : Re: 430 mhz band under th (now repeater costs)

In article <1993Jan1.150034.23723@ke4zv.uucp>, gary@ke4zv.uucp (Gary Coffman) writes:

|>

|> Not all closed systems have low activity, but are they making the
|> most effective usage of the spectrum for the total user community
|> when they prevent the majority of users from accessing the spectrum
|> they occupy? I don't think that question can be answered yes because
|> the same machine, if open, would serve a larger community of users.
|> Only if the closed machine had a membership of the entire active
|> amateur user community could it claim most effective use. And if
|> that's true, what's the difference between it and an open machine?
|>

Date: Mon, 4 Jan 1993 18:28:12 GMT
From: swrinde!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!oak!laborde@network.UCSD.EDU
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jan02.060703.6610@ssc.com>,
<1993Jan3.005747.7633@elroy.jpl.nasa.gov>, <1993Jan04.040322.16790@ssc.com>
Subject : Re: 430mhz band under th

In article <1993Jan04.040322.16790@ssc.com> tad@ssc.com (Tad Cook) writes:

>In article <1993Jan3.005747.7633@elroy.jpl.nasa.gov> laborde@oak.Jpl.Nasa.Gov
(Gregory R. LaBorde) writes:

>>

>>The difference is that they are interfering with QSOs in progress. We are
>>discussing transmissions on the input of a repeater that is not in use, if
>>I am not mistaken?

>

>HUH?? I must be mistaken then. I thought SURE that I was responding to
>someone who was advocating operating simplex on top of the input of a
>live, coordinated repeater....merely because it was not "open".

>

No, if you read the posts the topic under discussion is definitely transmission
on the input frequency of an "idle" repeater (ie operating but not in use).

-grl.

Date: Mon, 4 Jan 93 18:23:05 GMT
From: walter!porthos!dancer!whs70@uunet.uu.net
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <1992Dec31.074002.972@miavx3.mid.muohio.edu>, <1787@necis.UUCP>,
<1993Jan4.155901.17375@cbnewsm.cb.att.com>-
Subject : Re: Format of Code Exams?

In article <1993Jan4.155901.17375@cbnewsm.cb.att.com> jeffj@cbnewsm.cb.att.com
(jeffrey.n.jones) writes:

>In article <1787@necis.UUCP> rbono@necis.UUCP (Rich) writes:

>>

>> This was for all code speeds: 5 Wpm, 13 Wpm and 20 Wpm!

>> I don't have actual statistics, but it really did seem that there were
>>more failures with the multiple choice.

>>

>> My feeling is that if you can copy the code, then there is not a big

>>difference in the testing method used. Unless you get your heart set on
>>a particular exam style, then get upset when that is not what you are tested
>>with.

>>

>> I would like to hear other's thoughts on this. Maybe a scientific study
>>would provide some interesting results.

>

>Here's my own results from taking the CW tests;

>

>13 WPM: Passed 7 out of 10 on multiple choice test. Would have failed fill
> in the blanks.

I just upgraded and took the 13 wpm - No way I had a full minute of straight
copy, no way could I have filled in several of the answers if they were
fill in the blanks, I got 9 of 10 correct on the multiple choice.

Part of being able to work the multiple choice to your best advantage is
to look at the answers and see if you have even a partial match in your
copy for one of the answers. From what I could tell, the questions
followed the order of the code test...that is the answer to question number
3 would be after number 2 (in the code sent) and before the answer to
question number 4. Had the questions been "out-of-order" I'd likely
have missed 2 or 3 more questions.

An example of being able to make a partial match had to do with the name of an
individual that was asked in one question. The answers had 4 different
names, but in the general area of the text where I expected the answer,
I didn't have a full name, BUT I did have the letters "CK" which only
matched the last two characters of the answer "DICK."

As another poster mentioned, at least on a multiple choice you have a 1 in 4
possibility of guessing the correct answer, with the likelihood that
with some ability you can improve the odds by at least eliminating 1 or two
answers which you think are absolutely not correct.

Standard Disclaimer- Any opinions, etc. are mine and NOT my employer's.

Bill Sohl (K2UNK) BELLCORE (Bell Communications Research, Inc.)
Morristown, NJ email via UUCP bcr!cc!whs70
201-829-2879 Weekdays email via Internet whs70@cc.bellcore.com

End of Info-Hams Digest V93 #14
